



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/607,526	06/27/2003	Ronald J. Link	43738-0003C1 (187273)	6041
23973	7590	02/20/2008		
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH			EXAMINER	
ATTN: INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP			KOHUT, DAVID M	
ONE LOGAN SQUARE				
18TH AND CHERRY STREETS			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-6996			3626	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/20/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/607,526	Applicant(s) LINK ET AL.
	Examiner DAVID M. KOHUT	Art Unit 3626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 January 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/9/2008

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. In the RCE filed 9 January 2008, the IDS statement has been entered and considered. No new amendments or arguments were filed with the RCE.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Papageorge, U.S. Patent No. 6,584,445, reference A on the previously attached PTO-892, in view of Rakshit et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,799,282, reference B on the previously attached PTO-892.

4. As per claim 1, Papageorge teaches a computer implemented process for informing a patient of risks of undergoing a treatment, comprising: gathering semi-static data relating to contraindications to and complications associated with the treatment, i.e. while CHES consults medical experts as well, its outcome projections reflect statistically verified pattern differences in outcomes among treatments using many well-documented, published studies on treatment results to maximize the accuracy of the information provided and treatment, disease subcategories, concurrent conditions (related or unrelated), patient demographics, and any effect of recent medical advances in each treatment stratify the data from these studies (see column 7, lines 60-67 and

column 8, line 1 of Papageorge); gathering dynamic data relating to contraindications and complications that other patients experienced as a result of undergoing the treatment, said dynamic data comprising information about the treatment conduct, its result, and the other patients' response over time, i.e. while CHES consults medical experts as well, its outcome projections reflect statistically verified pattern differences in outcomes among treatments using many well-documented, published studies on treatment results to maximize the accuracy of the information provided and treatment, disease subcategories, concurrent conditions (related or unrelated), patient demographics, and any effect of recent medical advances in each treatment stratify the data from these studies (see column 7, lines 60-67 and column 8, line 1 of Papageorge); from the gathered semi-static data and dynamic data, creating a rule-based algorithm for calculating the risks of the patient undergoing the treatment, i.e. these elements are then used to evaluate the costs, risks, and benefits of competing treatments (see column 8, lines 2-4 of Papageorge); acquiring relevant data of the patient, i.e. the patient then answers the questionnaire, using single keystrokes to select choices (see column 7, lines 1-2 of Papageorge); calculating a customized personal risk assessment for the patient, i.e. the report summarizes the data from the users, with conditional text on how each response affects the course of the disease and the probable results of each treatment option (see column 5, lines 44-47 of Papageorge); and presenting the customized personal risk assessment to the patient, i.e. the report summarizes the data from the users, with conditional text on how each response affects the course of the disease and the probable results of each treatment option (see column

5, lines 44-47 of Papageorge). However, Papageorge does not explicitly teach the process wherein the risk assessment is an informed consent form. Rakshit et al., however, does teach a process wherein the patient receives an informed consent form, i.e. the system will print an informed consent form, listing the key aspects of the interaction, complete with Patient A's name and a signature line, the date and time of consent, and such information (see column 14, lines 11-15 of Rakshit et al.). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the process of Papageorge. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine these features in order to properly understand the necessary aspects of the procedure to be performed (see column 3, lines 51-52 of Rakshit et al.).

5. As per claim 2, Papageorge and Rakshit et al. teach the process of claim 1 as described above. Papageorge further teaches the process wherein the step of creating a rule-based algorithm for calculating the risks of undergoing the treatment comprises: periodically updating both the semi-static data and dynamic data, i.e. CHES will have ongoing system updates to assure that they reflect the latest in medical knowledge and treatment technology to prevent the system from becoming obsolete (see column 9, lines 38-41 of Papageorge).

6. As per claim 3, Papageorge and Rakshit et al. teach the process of claim 1 as described above. Papageorge further teaches the process wherein the step of creating a rule-based algorithm for calculating the risks of undergoing the treatment comprises: recursively processing the rules governing the risk assessment relating to any treatment

based on periodic updates to one or both of the semi-static and dynamic data, i.e. CHES will have ongoing system updates to assure that they reflect the latest in medical knowledge and treatment technology to prevent the system from becoming obsolete (see column 9, lines 38-41 of Papageorge).

7. As per claim 4, Papageorge and Rakshit et al. teach the process of claim 1 as described above. Papageorge further teaches the process further comprising the step: formulating text material in the form of sentences that list risk factors and outcome information for display to the patient based on information gathered in the process, i.e. in creating the system conditional text would be written for each possible physician and patient questionnaire response, explaining its positive or negative impact on outcome (see column 9, lines 6-8 of Papageorge).

8. As per claim 5, Papageorge and Rakshit et al. teach the process of claim 4 as described above. Papageorge further teaches the process further comprising the step: creating a calculus that associates text sentences with the risk information to be presented to the patient, i.e. format a report showing the responses and conditional text, the patient's risk tolerance profile, patient and physician treatment preferences, how they compare to that found to be most cost-effective, and the factors supporting their choice (see column 9, lines 9-13 of Papageorge).

9. As per claim 6, Papageorge and Rakshit et al. teach the process of claim 1 as described above. Papageorge further teaches the process wherein the step of gathering dynamic data relating to experienced contraindications and complications associated with the treatment includes: identifying a particular treatment provider, and

incorporating data relating to the treatment provider, i.e. the users (patient, physician, and insurer) receive outcome data (morbidity and mortality rates) on each treatment and are told that these statistics are compiled from many published studies and must only be used to compare outcomes in their own geographic area (this resembles Prudential Insurance's program of paying patients' travel expenses to centers with the best outcomes on specific procedures) (see column 7, lines 25-32 of Papageorge).

10. As per claim 7, Papageorge and Rakshit et al. teach the process of claim 6 as described above. Papageorge further teaches the process wherein the step of incorporating data relating to the treatment provider further comprises: gathering and including data on the treatment provider's outcome history associated with the treatment, i.e. the users (patient, physician, and insurer) receive outcome data (morbidity and mortality rates) on each treatment and are told that these statistics are compiled from many published studies and must only be used to compare outcomes in their own geographic area (this resembles Prudential Insurance's program of paying patients' travel expenses to centers with the best outcomes on specific procedures) (see column 7, lines 25-32 of Papageorge).

11. As per claim 8, Papageorge and Rakshit et al. teach the process of claim 7 as described above. Papageorge further teaches the process wherein the step of incorporating data relating to the treatment provider further comprises: gathering and including data on the treatment provider's complication history in providing the subject treatment, i.e. the users (patient, physician, and insurer) receive outcome data (morbidity and mortality rates) on each treatment and are told that these statistics are

compiled from many published studies and must only be used to compare outcomes in their own geographic area (this resembles Prudential Insurance's program of paying patients' travel expenses to centers with the best outcomes on specific procedures) (see column 7, lines 25-32 of Papageorge).

12. As per claim 9, Papageorge and Rakshit et al. teach the process of claim 1 as described above. Rakshit et al. further teaches the process which includes gathering information about the pre-operative and post-operative care of the treatment provider's patients, i.e. this interactive process may continue for sections on the alternative choices to an abdominal hysterectomy, post-operative care, pre-operative preparation, etc. (see column 13, lines 57-59 of Rakshit et al.). It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the method of Papageorge. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature in order to help bridge the gaps that have existed between the legal, medical, consumer and training fields with respect to establishing certifiable informed consent (see column 4, lines 31-34 of Rakshit et al.).

13. As per claim 10, Papageorge teaches a computer-implemented process for informing a patient of risks of undergoing a treatment, comprising: gathering semi-static data relating to contraindications to and complications associated with the treatment, i.e. while CHES consults medical experts as well, its outcome projections reflect statistically verified pattern differences in outcomes among treatments using many well-documented, published studies on treatment results to maximize the accuracy of the information provided and treatment, disease subcategories, concurrent conditions

(related or unrelated), patient demographics, and any effect of recent medical advances in each treatment stratify the data from these studies (see column 7, lines 60-67 and column 8, line 1 of Papageorge); acquiring relevant data of the patient, i.e. the patient then answers the questionnaire, using single keystrokes to select choices (see column 7, lines 1-2 of Papageorge); calculating a customized personal risk assessment for the patient, i.e. the report summarizes the data from the users, with conditional text on how each response affects the course of the disease and the probable results of each treatment option (see column 5, lines 44-47 of Papageorge); and presenting the customized personal risk assessment to the patient, i.e. the report summarizes the data from the users, with conditional text on how each response affects the course of the disease and the probable results of each treatment option (see column 5, lines 44-47 of Papageorge). However, Papageorge does not explicitly teach the process wherein the customized personal risk assessment is an informed consent form. Rakshit et al., however, does teach a process wherein the patient receives an informed consent form, i.e. the system will print an informed consent form, listing the key aspects of the interaction, complete with Patient A's name and a signature line, the date and time of consent, and such information (see column 14, lines 11-15 of Rakshit et al.). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the process of Papageorge. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine these features in order to properly understand the necessary aspects of the procedure to be performed (see column 3, lines 51-52 of Rakshit et al.).

14. As per claim 11, Papageorge and Rakshit et al. teach the process of claim 10 as described above. Papageorge further teaches printing out the individualized risk assessment, i.e. the report informs physicians and patients of the costs, risks, and benefits of all treatment (see column 10, lines 5 and 8-9 of Papageorge). Additionally, Rakshit et al. further teaches the process wherein the presenting of the customized personal risk assessment to the patient further comprises printing the informed consent form, i.e. upon mastery of all objectives, the system will print an informed consent form, listing the key aspects of the interaction (see column 13, lines 63-64 of Rakshit et al.). It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the process of Papageorge. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature because using existing techniques, many non-emergency type surgical procedures require the patient to read and sign an “informed consent” form (see column 1, lines 32-34 of Rakshit et al.).

15. Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Papageorge, U.S. Patent No. 6,584,445, reference A on the previously attached PTO-892, in view of Rakshit et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,799,282, reference B on the previously attached PTO-892, and Tyuluman et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,924,073, reference C on the previously attached PTO-892.

16. As per claim 12, Papageorge and Rakshit et al. teach the process of claim 10 as described above. Papageorge further teaches the process further comprising: gathering performance data including information on treatment outcomes a, i.e. the

users (patient, physician, and insurer) receive outcome data (morbidity and mortality rates) on each treatment and are told that these statistics are compiled from many published studies and must only be used to compare outcomes in their own geographic area (this resembles Prudential Insurance's program of paying patients' travel expenses to centers with the best outcomes on specific procedures) (see column 7, lines 25-32 of Papageorge). However, neither Papageorge nor Rakshit et al. teach the process wherein the performance data is specific to the provider's prior patients. Tyuluman et al., however, teaches a process wherein the performance data relates to a provider who performs the treatment including information on treatment outcomes after undergoing the treatment for other patients of the provider, i.e. the patient specific physician performance data may include information relating to a physician's ability to efficiently assess and treat an ailment (see column 8, lines 39-42 of Tyuluman et al.). It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the processes of Papageorge and Rakshit et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature in order to decide whether to seek medical treatment from a particular physician or health care provider (see column 11, lines 19-21 of Tyuluman et al.).

17. As per claim 13, Papageorge, Rakshit et al., and Tyuluman et al. teach the process of claim 12 as described above. Papageorge further teaches the process further comprising the step: from the gathered semi-static data, the patient data, and treatment provider data, creating a rule-based algorithm for calculating the risks of the patient undergoing the treatment, i.e. the computer system uses an algorithm for

weighing the patient data and the physician data in view of the database (see abstract, lines 9-11 of Papageorge).

18. As per claim 14, Papageorge, Rakshit et al., and Tyuluman et al. teach the process of claim 13 as described above. Papageorge further teaches the process further comprising the step of: recursively processing the rules governing the risk assessment relating to any treatment based on periodic updates to the semi-static data, the patient data, and provider data, i.e. CHES will have ongoing system updates to assure that they reflect the latest in medical knowledge and treatment technology to prevent the system from becoming obsolete (see column 9, lines 38-41 of Papageorge).

Conclusion

19. Applicant's RCE did not contain any new amendments or arguments.

Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

20. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to David M. Kohut, Esq. whose telephone number is 571-270-1369. The Examiner can normally be reached M-Th 730-5 w/1st Fri off. 2nd Fri 730-4.
22. If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached at 571-272-6776. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.
23. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/D. M. K./
Examiner, Art Unit 3626
1/30/2008

/C. Luke Gilligan/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3626